

# CACC MEETING MINUTES

## COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, August 19, 2010  
9:00 AM - 11:30 AM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT  
1501 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007



AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-866-751-5725  
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 6109722

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson\*  
Timothy Dickerson\*  
Julie Dybas  
Joan Harphant  
Mary Hawkins\*  
Donald Jacobson  
Phillip Knox\*  
Patrick McGrath  
Richard McHattie  
Patricia Noland\*  
Michael Pollard, *Chair*  
Rick Rager  
Lisa Royal\*  
Paul Thomas

### GUESTS

Steve Ballance\*, *Pima Superior Court*

### MEMBERS ABSENT

Cathy Clarich  
Doug Pilcher

### AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*  
William Earl, *ITD*  
Bob Macon, *ITD*  
Alicia Moffatt, *ITD*  
Jim Price, *ITD*  
Tony Sita, *CSD*

\* indicates appeared by telephone

## **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order just after 9:00 a.m. and congratulated member Rick Rager on being named Court Administrator for Tempe. He then read a proposed revision to CACC's mission statement resulting from the recent refinement of direction and requested comments from members. A roll call of those in the room and on the phone confirmed that a quorum existed.

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the July 22, 2010, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

## **TOOL TO INDICATE FUNCTIONALITY AND DEPENDENCIES**

Judge Pollard reminded members that the project status dashboard tool is being replaced by the MindMap tool, with goals of encouraging more open communication and collaboration while surfacing for discussion interdependencies among projects and identifying conflicting priorities. Members asked detailed questions about various notations on and mechanics of this month's MindMap. Karl Heckart, the originator of the map, was not present, but Stewart Bruner collected the questions and concerns to share with him. Stewart explained that the detail and span of the map is being expanded with each passing month, from key AOC projects, to integration items, to larger single-court projects, to the policies and infrastructure items they need. He described the way he plans to show date changes to prompt detailed discussion for upcoming meetings. Members stated that they desire increased consistency in notation and details on subsequent iterations of the map and that a multi-page approach that makes the details of each strategic project easier to follow, like a decomposition diagram, would be easier for them to digest.

Discussion turned to the practical use of the map to determine agenda items and time allotments for meetings, especially how frequently to bring individual projects before CACC and how many managers of related projects ought to appear together. Stewart reminded members of Karl's viewpoint that events rather than time should drive verbal updates. Stewart described his approach for contacting managers of projects related to ones on the map using a spreadsheet for capturing the data necessary for him to draw milestone details. He expressed confidence that his method would be effective to both update existing data and solicit new data, despite the fact that 19 projects are already represented on the map.

Rick Rager observed two clusters of due dates approaching and warned that, because the dates weren't created in consultation with dependent projects, there could be large implications. He also suggested that limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts having non-AZTEC CMSs be included on the map to document local modifications necessitated by TurboCourt's implementation. Rona Newton also noted the priority dependencies that exist among projects in the JOLTSaz space.

Consensus about meeting frequency and focus was to continue to meet monthly, extend the scheduled time beyond lunch, schedule updates on all strategic projects initially, then take updates every month but only request certain projects to appear with representatives of their related projects when conditions warrant. This approach does the best job of assuring communication is occurring and getting opportunities to see what CACC could do to help each project be successful.

## **GENERAL JURISDICTION COURTS CMS UPDATE – AJACS**

William Earl, AOC's AJACS software release manager, reviewed the largest features of AJACS Release 3.4.1, including OnBase integration, metadata update ability for security keywords, improved priority of payments, improved contracts management, and defect fixes. Release 3.5, considered a "stability release," will contain both the FARE and ADRS interfaces, as currently planned, and address a large number of defects. William described the complex process of constructing the calendar for each upcoming software release. He noted a couple of items not within the AJACS application itself that continue to plague users.

Joan Harphant asked William about a rumor that AOC has already decided not to convert AZTEC data from LJ courts. He answered that experience with the GJ courts points out the wisdom of converting as little data as possible, but no decision has been made. A decision that has been made is that AOC will not require courts to work with two systems simultaneously. Rick shared Tempe's post-implementation experience of having to open and move certain previously closed cases. William agreed conversion on demand remains a possibility.

## **POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS**

In Project Manager Renny Rapier's absence, Tony Sita from the AJACS enhancement project briefed members on the success of the August 7 implementation of AJACS 3.4.1 in five courts. He reviewed the lessons learned and the changes being put in place to prevent the minor problems uncovered from recurring in the six courts being upgraded August 21. After that work, all AJACS superior courts will be on Release 3.4.1.

## **PACC UPDATE**

Rona Newton gave a brief outline of topics for the August 25 Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC) meeting and timeline of upcoming activities related to the reformulation of PACC's membership and role. She will be requesting members from Committee on Probation August 27.

## **STATEWIDE E-FILING UPDATE**

Jim Price, e-Filing Project Manager at the AOC, acted as the test case for using the MindMap in a meeting as he updated members on the anticipated delivery dates of three applications: Appellate e-Filing on November 1, Maricopa Justice Courts e-Filing on November 16, and Pima Superior Court e-Filing on November 30. He delineated various risks that affect the implementation dates, including a policy change related to auto-acceptance of filings versus clerk review and rejection (Clerks' Office representatives in the meeting voiced their objections to any change in the current policy), population of the central case index with the necessary data from the individual case management systems, and agreement with Intresys on the standard XML messages necessary to accomplish population and validation of data associated with filings in TurboCourt. Jim described the XML agreement as the longest lead item and gave his goal for agreement as September 7 after which work will begin on the applications to read and write the messages.

Concern existed about a lack of visibility into the specific infrastructure items on which the e-filing timelines given depend. Don Jacobson recommended that AOC integration team members

# CACC MEETING MINUTES

be included in future meetings to shed light on the details. Jim outlined the distinction between the existence of the generic infrastructure and that of the specific functionality being built within the infrastructure items. He recommended the portion of the MindMap labeled “Infrastructure” be redrawn as “System Domains” for next month, including Integration, Infrastructure Operations, and Support Center. Jim also added a complicating factor to the map by making the point that all of his CMS-related transactions flow through the infrastructure items, so he actually has two layers of dependencies. He wondered whether the three CMS managers (Appellamation, iCIS LJ, and AGAVE) would need to appear with him in future meetings. Consensus was to focus on the most critical item(s), what help could be brought to bear (such as a course of action or appropriate subject matter expert to consult) and stick to the target of increasing collaboration.

In light of Jim’s initial presentation using the MindMap, the chair summarized decisions about future meetings: Initially, all strategic projects will be reviewed to some extent with expanded focus on the most critical milestones and dependencies, like e-filing. Over time, the group will get a better feel for what projects require more focus and what projects require less focus in any given month, to make the best balance between use of members’ time in the meeting and fulfilling the duty CACC has to COT.

The next meeting will take place in **Room 230** of the **State Courts Building** on **September 16, 2010**. Dates are being reserved for 2011 CACC meetings and will be posted once determined

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.